

Via Electronic Filing (ECFS)

June 20, 2017

Marlene H. Dortch
Office of the Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street SW, Room TW-A325
Washington, D.C. 20554

Re: The State of Minnesota's Telecommunications Relay Services
Annual Consumer Complaint Log Summary (CG Docket No. 03-123)

Dear Ms. Dortch,

Pursuant to Code of Federal Regulations, title 47, section 64.604, paragraph (c)(1), the Minnesota Department of Commerce – Telecommunications Access Minnesota respectfully submits Minnesota's Telecommunications Relay Services (TRS) Annual Consumer Complaint Log Summary for the twelve month period commencing on June 1, 2016, and ending on May 31, 2017.

Minnesota Relay received twenty (20) complaints during this reporting period. All complaints were timely resolved.

Attached please find the following report documents:

1. Complaint tally sheet categorizing complaints by type (Attachment A).
2. Complaint log summaries for complaints received June 1, 2016, through May 31, 2017, including the date of complaint, type of relay call, category number of complaint, nature of the complaint, date of resolution, and explanation of the resolution (Attachment B).

The report includes complaints received by the TRS state administrator, Minnesota Relay center supervisors, Minnesota Relay Outreach Office, Sprint Customer Service, CapTel Customer Service, and Sprint account manager that allege a violation of the federal TRS mandatory minimum standards.

Marlene H. Dortch

June 20, 2017

Page 2

Minnesota Relay's call volume (interstate and intrastate) by type of TRS call during the period of June 1, 2016, through May 31, 2017, was as follows:

- *Traditional TRS Total Calls*: 106,759
- *Speech-to-Speech Total Calls*: 13,393
- *Captioned Telephone Service Answered Calls*: 264,791
- *Internet Protocol Captioned Telephone Service*: Not applicable; Minnesota does not contract for this service.
- *Internet Protocol Relay*: Not applicable; Minnesota does not contract for this service.
- *Video Relay Service*: Not applicable; Minnesota does not contract for this service.

If I can be of further assistance, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Rochelle Renée Garrow".

Rochelle Garrow, TAM Administrator

Phone: 651-539-1878

E-mail: rochelle.garrow@state.mn.us

cc: Daniel P. Wolf, MN Public Utilities Commission Executive Secretary
Michael McCarthy, MN Public Utilities Commission
Greg Doyle, MN Department of Commerce
Liz D'Anna, Sprint Relay

Minnesota Relay Complaints By Category

June 1, 2016 - May 31, 2017

SERVICE COMPLAINTS		Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	TOTAL	Percent
#00	Answer Wait Time													0	0%
#01	Dial Out Time													0	0%
#02	Didn't Follow Database Instructions													0	0%
#03	Didn't Follow Customer Instructions													0	0%
#04	Didn't Keep Customer Informed													0	0%
#05	Agent Disconnected Caller								1					1	5%
#06	Poor Spelling													0	0%
#07	Typing Speed/Accuracy			1							1	1		3	15%
#08	Poor Voice Tone				1									1	5%
#09	Everything Relayed													0	0%
#10	HCO Procedures Not Followed													0	0%
#11	VCO Procedures Not Followed													0	0%
#12	Two-Line VCO Procedure Not Followed													0	0%
#13	Background Noise Not Typed													0	0%
#14	Feelings Not Described													0	0%
#15	Recording Feature Not Used													0	0%
#16	Noise in Center													0	0%
#17	Agent Was Rude													0	0%
#18	Answering Machine Retrieval Problems													0	0%
#19	Spanish Service													0	0%
#20	Speech to Speech	0	1		1			3	1			1		7	35%
#21	Other Problem Type Complaint							1						1	5%
Sub-Total		0	1	1	2	0	0	4	2	0	1	2	0	13	

TECHNICAL COMPLAINTS		Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	TOTAL	Percent
#22	Lost Branding													0	0%
#23	Charged for Local Call													0	0%
#24	Trouble Linking Up			1				1	1	1				4	20%
#25	Line Disconnected										1			1	5%
#26	Garbled Message										1			1	5%
#27	Database Not Available													0	0%
#28	Split Screen													0	0%
#29	Other Technical Type Complaint				1									1	5%
#57	Caller ID													0	0%
#58	Regional 800 Calls													0	0%
#59	Transmission (Can't hear or be heard)													0	0%
Sub-Total		0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	2	0	0	7	

MISC COMPLAINTS		Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	TOTAL	Percent
#30	Rates													0	0%
#31	On Screen Display													0	0%
#32	No 900 Number													0	0%
#33	Carrier of Choice													0	0%
#34	Network Recording													0	0%
#35	Other													0	0%
Sub-Total		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

TOTAL COMPLAINTS	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Report Year
	0	1	2	3	0	0	5	3	1	3	2	0	20

Minnesota Relay Consumer Complaints for June 1, 2016 - May 31, 2017
Total Complaints: 20

Date Received	Type of Relay Call	Category Number of Complaint	Nature of Complaint	Date of Resolution	Explanation of Resolution
7/15/2016	STS	#20	A Speech to Speech user had asked the CA processing the call to hold, then the customer disconnected. When the STS user called back into relay he/she was upset that he/she had to start over with the message. Assistant Supervisor documented the concern and apologized for the inconvenience. No follow up requested.	7/15/2016	Since the message was not intended to be saved in the 24-hour messaging, the CA had followed the correct procedure set in place.
08/24/16	CapTel	#07	Customer reported inaccurate spelling of medication and street names during a captioned call but did not have call specifics.	08/24/16	Customer Service apologized for the incident and thanked the customer for bringing his experience to their attention. Customer service explained to the customer that not all medication and street names are familiar to the CA, and the CA is not able to ask for clarification during the call. Customer Service provided tips to confirm the spelling of important keywords such as medication with the speaker during the call. Customer service suggested the customer document the date time and CA number of any future calls to allow specific action with the CA captioning the call.
08/29/16	TTY	#24	Customer stated that she cannot call her sister through relay when using Comcast as her COC. The CA gets a recorded message that the call will not go through. Customer has had problems with this before and wants to make sure it is reported.	09/01/16	Customer service apologized for the problem and assured that a trouble ticket would be turned in. Tech support researched the issue. The customer needs to establish an account with Comcast. Currently it is showing that she does not have an account set up with Comcast so it has denied her calls. Customer Service left a message for the customer with the update to contact Comcast.

Date Received	Type of Relay Call	Category Number of Complaint	Nature of Complaint	Date of Resolution	Explanation of Resolution
9/1/2016	STS	#20	Customer says the agent was having difficulty understanding him and he asked the CA for the supervisor. The CA responded that she/he was not allowed to be involved in the conversation. The customer disconnected. Follow up requested via phone call.	9/1/2016	The assistant supervisor documenting the concern apologized for the inconvenience. The supervisor investigated the CA's procedural knowledge and the CA demonstrated knowledge of the correct procedures to process this type of call. Supervisor left a message on customer's answering machine.
9/2/2016	STS	#08	Customer called with a concern about the CA not doing as well as was done on past calls. Follow up requested via phone call.	09/02/16	The assistant supervisor documenting the concern apologized for the inconvenience. The supervisor coached the CA to be mindful of voice tone and to seek assistance if necessary. Followed up with customer via phone call as per request.
9/2/2016	STS	#29	Customer reports interference on his relay calls. Customer requested follow up.	9/7/2016	Technical ticket was opened. Sprint tech support placed 20+ test calls into the Minnesota Relay center using the STS toll-free and local test 800 number. All outbound calls were placed to the phone number provided by the customer. All test calls completed with no static. Placed test calls into CA station using customer's from and to phone numbers; all test calls completed with no static heard. Checked the ACD; no errors were recorded in the switch on the day of the issue. The program manager made the follow-up call to the customer. The customer agreed that the ticket could be closed.

Date Received	Type of Relay Call	Category Number of Complaint	Nature of Complaint	Date of Resolution	Explanation of Resolution
12/2/2016	STS	#20	Caller reported that when Speech-to-Speech gets very busy his calls are sent to the Moorhead call center. It appears to him that the Moorhead CAs are in need of additional training because they have trouble understanding his voice. He said he uses a trach and a speaker phone and gets as close as possible to the phone for his calls. He would like follow up call and would offer any help he could to make the service better.	12/02/16	Customer service apologized for the inconvenience and asked if it was possible for him to get closer to the speaker phone for a louder transmission. He stated that he is as close as he can get. The supervisor coached the CA on how to better handle this type of call. Supervisor followed up with the customer via phone call.
12/6/2016	STS	#20	Speech-to-Speech user stated the CA was unable to understand what is being said and it is very frustrating. Customer also stated the CA was unable to understand his request to speak to a supervisor. Follow up requested via phone call.	12/06/16	The assistant supervisor documenting the concern apologized for the inconvenience. The CA was met with and coached on how to better handle these types of calls. A follow up call was placed to the customer.
12/8/2016	STS	#20	Speech-to-Speech customer stated that he is frustrated because the CA had to ask him to repeat many times. When the customer asked the CA why he needed to repeat so many times the CA did not respond. Follow up requested.	12/8/2016	The assistant supervisor documenting the concern apologized for the inconvenience. The supervisor coached the CA on different techniques to understand the Speech-to-Speech user. Followed up with customer via phone call as per request.

Date Received	Type of Relay Call	Category Number of Complaint	Nature of Complaint	Date of Resolution	Explanation of Resolution
12/19/2016	Voice	#24	Customer tried calling into relay via 7-1-1 but received a recorded message that no one was available and to please leave a message. No follow-up requested.	12/21/2016	Outreach specialist explained that as customer was calling from a business it could be a configuration issue with the 7-1-1 dialing access. Provided her with the toll-free relay number. Tech support researched the issue. Minnesota Relay does not have that type of recording on the TRS platform. Was unable to locate any calls in the past two months from the customer's number in the call logs. Customer did not request follow-up.
12/29/2016	STS	#21	Customer is concerned about the training of after-hours CAs. He requested the last number he dialed from a previous calling session with relay.	12/29/16	Customer Service Manager e-mailed the customer and apologized. Educated the customer on what customer service representatives are capable of and assured him that all customer service representatives would be reminded of Last Number Redial procedures.
01/02/17	Voice	#24	Customer stated that she could not reach relay dialing 7-1-1 via her mobile phone. Customer did not request follow-up.	01/12/17	Customer Service opened a trouble ticket. After review, no trouble found with Minnesota Relay 7-1-1 access. The toll-free translation 866-711-2526 was also reviewed. The relay user needs to contact their mobile carrier and report that 7-1-1 is not working.
01/03/17	TTY	#05	Caller believes that midway through her relay call the CA disconnected from both the inbound and the outbound parties. Follow-up is requested.	01/03/17	Customer Service informed the caller that a report would be sent to the call center supervisor for investigation. The CA does not remember the call; however, the CA was coached by a supervisor regarding the consequences of disconnecting calls. Follow-up with consumer was not possible due to no contact information being listed.

Date Received	Type of Relay Call	Category Number of Complaint	Nature of Complaint	Date of Resolution	Explanation of Resolution
01/23/17	STS	#20	Speech-to-Speech user stated that the CA was having problems understanding him and he and was trying to help the CA. The customer requested for another CA to continue the call, but was told there were none available at the time. Follow-up requested via phone call.	01/23/17	The assistant supervisor apologized for the inconvenience. The supervisor checked and determined that no additional Speech-to-Speech CAs were available at the time of the request. The supervisor called the customer and discussed suggestions on how the service could be improved.
02/06/17	STS	#24	Customer states that the line was cutting in and out on a call. Customer states that he has had problems with the line before and worked with relay to get it resolved. Customer wishes follow up assistance on this matter.	02/10/17	Assistant supervisor apologized for the inconvenience and assured the customer that this will be referred to a technician. Supervisor opened a trouble ticket. Program manager spoke with customer and explained that troubleshooting was performed on the CA's workstation. No issues were found, nor did any other STS user report a problem. The equipment distribution program conducted a home visit to review the customer's setup and make test calls. Customer gave permission to close the ticket.
3/6/2017	CapTel	#26	Consumer was speaking with a CapTel user. Consumer stated that the CA used so many abbreviated words that the CapTel user could not make out any sentences at all. The consumer stated to the CA "Captioner, please type out all words and don't abbreviate". Once the request was made, the CapTel user was able to read what the consumer said just fine.		Sprint contacted the consumer's telephone company, who stated that the consumer has analog phone service currently, but that her connection does route through a digital/internet connection so it's not a POTS connection end to end. Sprint suspects that there were dropped characters or packets of letters lost in transmission that may have coincidentally gotten better after the speaker said something. Sprint wanted to speak to the customer to better understand the issues she is experiencing, but customer did not want follow-up.

Date Received	Type of Relay Call	Category Number of Complaint	Nature of Complaint	Date of Resolution	Explanation of Resolution
3/20/2017	CapTel	#07	Customer's daughter reported inaccurate captions during a captioned call.	03/24/17	Customer service apologized for the incident and thanked customer's daughter for the feedback. Call detail was shared with call center management for follow up with the CA by the CA's supervisor. The CA's supervisor met with the CA and discussed the importance of captioning verbatim. The CA also received further coaching and training. Customer service followed up with the customer's daughter by phone reporting action taken.
3/22/2017	VCO	#25	Caller said he placed a call of long length and at the end of the call as sign offs were taking place, the call dropped. No follow-up with caller is required.	03/22/17	Customer service apologized and sent the complaint. Supervisor coached the CA on the importance of not disconnecting the call too soon, and not disconnecting the inbound caller. CA understood.
4/9/2017	STS	#20	Caller was told that he could not place a call to directory assistance without the city, state, zip, and area code of the area he was searching. The CA and supervisor refused to place the call even though he has placed calls to directory assistance with incomplete information before. Caller said that the directory assistance operator has been able to help him without complete information. The caller would like follow up.	04/10/17	Supervisor met with the CA and the assistant supervisor regarding this issue. They both were coached and now understands correct procedure when assisting with Directory Assistance requests. Supervisor followed up with customer via phone as requested.

Date Received	Type of Relay Call	Category Number of Complaint	Nature of Complaint	Date of Resolution	Explanation of Resolution
4/17/2017	CapTel	#07	Customer reported incomplete captions on a recent call with the CapTel 800.	04/17/17	Customer service apologized for the incident and thanked the customer for the feedback. Call detail was shared with call center management for follow up with the CA by the CA's supervisor. The CA's supervisor met with the CA and provided coaching tips to use while captioning. The CA was reminded the proper procedure for entering technical trouble ticket issues on calls.